

with the bill by the end of the week. Do we have any plans as to how to deal with that issue? Or do you have any information that I don't have that would suggest that it is likely that the Senate will have agreed to a bill that we can agree to?

One option, obviously, would be agree to the bill that the House sent over. But I am interested in what happens on Friday, and between now and Friday that might settle that also, that important issue as well.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. On February 15, of course, the existing CR expires in terms of authorization for the funding of the departments that were unfunded in the budget cycle, in the appropriation cycle, so that we need to take action to keep the government operating for all agencies other than Homeland Security and the Defense Department.

We are trying to plan on the contingencies. Obviously, one of the alternatives you mentioned is one that we would hope might be followed, and that is the adoption of the House-passed CR, which we think is one that obviously a broad number of this House supported in a bipartisan fashion. We would hope that the other body would.

But if they do not move ahead, we are discussing the possibility of some short-term CR. But those discussions have not moved beyond the contemplation that they may be necessary. They have not come to any decision as to how long it would be.

Clearly, one of the problems, as the gentleman knows, is we are leaving for a week for the Presidents' Day District Work Period, so that we would not be here at least for the following week. One of the reasons obviously Friday may be a very long day will be because the CR will have expired if we don't pass something, and we may have to deal with it that day, as well as ending the debate that we referred to previously.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I would assume that fairly early in the week, it is likely, it is possible, at least, that having to deal with that CR question will appear to be likely rather than not. I will be glad to join with you in watching that closely early in the week. We look forward to the debate.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get into a long debate, but I do want to make an observation.

Mr. DREIER was critical that we put today's bill on the floor, and he indicated he thought it would take just a few minutes to pass and that everybody would be for it. The Members were hoping that would be the case. But you never can tell.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate those comments. And, of course, after the 6 weeks that we have had of no oppor-

tunity to express our views, we were eager to express those, and we were grateful for the open rule. And, frankly, we were able to, I think, bring some good debate to the floor.

The re-voting issue surprised me because when we re-voted those amendments that had been passed in the House, on one amendment, 57 people changed their mind between the vote and the re-vote. And on another one, 25 people changed their mind. I had always assumed there was more consistency in the voting than that, but I guess 30 minutes can make a big difference in how that goes.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think the expression you saw was not on the merits of the amendments.

Mr. BLUNT. That very well could be. I am sure that those Members will be able to explain that fully in that way.

I thank the gentleman for the information.

—  
**HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW, ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2007, HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2007, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2007**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow; that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate; that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, for morning hour debate as though after May 14, 2007, thereafter to resume its session at 10 a.m.; and further, when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 15, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Friday, February 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

—  
**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### ENERGY SECURITY

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, on Friday, the Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change released its fourth report on the state of climate change science. This report is the most comprehensive, unbiased summary of the climate situation because it evaluates all peer-reviewed research published around the world and draws only the most conservative conclusions.

The report found that the evidence of global warming is unequivocal, and that the culprit is almost certainly our emissions.

However, this troubling scientific consensus is not acceptable to some, like the American Enterprise Institute, which sent a letter to climate scientists offering them \$10,000 to write articles challenging the IPCC's analysis. This is an appalling attempt by vested interests to buy science that is more convenient for their outdated philosophy. However, it is also encouraging because it demonstrates just how desperate the climate skeptics are.

The IPCC report is the writing on the wall. The American people are demanding comprehensive climate change legislation, and we can delay no longer.

#### HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, growing up, high school, college, even in the Army, law school, people were always coming up with these brain twister questions they want you to think about.

And as I sat here today thinking through the debates going back and forth, I had a question that I thought might be good to ask. If a luxury jet liner is flying, taking off from Washington, D.C., and flying nonstop to San Francisco with one passenger and 16 crew members, and they land in San Francisco with the one passenger, the Speaker, and then, instead of stopping, they refuel and take off nonstop for American Samoa, at what point, if any, during the flight do any of the crew members fall under the minimum wage requirements of the Federal Government?

Interesting question.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SHEA-PORTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pursuant to rule XI, clause